



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

APPENDIX.

(TO THE EDITOR OF THE *ULSTER JOURNAL OF ARCHÆOLOGY*.)

Belfast, 31st March, 1857.

DEAR SIR,—When I endeavoured in a former number of the *Archæological Journal* to discuss the question of the position of the ford, from which this town derives its name, I considered it a fit subject of antiquarian research, and in that light only presented it to your notice. Mr. Lowry had already published such information as he had collected, illustrated by a “plan,” which, *he says*, “was originally published in Rapin’s History of England, but has been subsequently copied into the local histories and almanacs of the town.” In your October number, the same writer has objected to my views, without, as far as I can observe, adding any new facts to existing information. As I also have no additional proofs to offer, I do not ask leave to occupy any portion of your limited space with explanations. I feel obliged, however, by being permitted to attach a reply, as an appendix, to the present number of the journal.

There is no doubt that the original harbour or landing-place was in the bed of the stream, which is now covered over, in High-street, and that vessels loaded and unloaded as far up as Skipper-street. It is also perfectly true that in passing to this harbour it was necessary to cross the ford, whose removal I have described. These facts, however, which are not new, do not affect the question under discussion; for it is not difficult to understand that, as vessels could only reach the town when the tide rose, the ford presented no insuperable impediment to their entrance into the Farsat river. A ford in a bay or river so shallow at low-water as this undoubtedly was could be little more than a road-way slightly raised above the natural level, and a proper allowance being made for the fall from Skipper-street to the Lagan, the probability is that the bottom of the river where the vessels lay was at a higher level than the top of the ford. Records as far as they exist, and analogy from natural appearances, shew that at no time could the Lagan have excavated for itself a deep channel, for the quantity of water it discharges being measured by the extent of country drained, must at all times have been limited. In fact, the deep water to the town has been altogether the result of art. In the first place, the erection of weirs and locks in its ancient bed prevented the material from the upper country brought down by freshes being deposited in the bay or river near the town; and consequently the works carried on by different corporate bodies since 1785 not being counteracted by alluvial deposits, have tended to increase the depth, the rush of both tide and river being confined in one channel. This principle was fully recognized by the eminent men under whose control the harbour has been since 1831; for Messrs. Walker and Burges, in making a new channel with deep water, calculated with mathematical accuracy the precise depth and breadth that the natural scour

would keep open without artificial means, and succeeded so admirably that the soundings taken for the Admiralty by Commander Hoskyn, in 1856, exhibit the channel unchanged since it was opened. Indeed, the very purchase which has directed Mr. Lowry’s attention to the question was made to enable the Harbour Trust to narrow the space between the county Down and Antrim from a broad shallow strand to a deep river of 400 or 450 feet wide.

It is difficult to ascertain with any degree of certainty what influenced the acts of parties at remote periods. It is, however, certain that when James I., in 1613, established the Corporation of Belfast, a town which owed its origin to the ford, he granted the conservancy of the harbour to the lord of the castle, and that the sovereign or chief magistrate for the time being held the office of water bailiff, making a yearly acknowledgement to the seneschal. Whether this conservancy extended beyond the harbour in the creek of the small river which passed through the town I have no means of judging. The same king also granted by his charter to the sovereign, free burgesses, and commonalty of the borough, “that hereafter it shall and may be lawful for all and singular, the freemen of the borough and their successors, to erect and establish within the franchises of the said borough a wharf or quay, in some convenient place on the bay or creek of Belfast aforesaid.” The quay erected under this clause was most probably that on the south side of the Farsat river, and perhaps the part extending along the Lagan from the custom-house corner to the Long Bridge, for along these quays the corporation and the Chichester family claimed jurisdiction, and it is probable the boundary of the franchise influenced the choice of the site for the quay. It was not till 1769 that the quay on the north side of the Farsat was erected by a Belfast merchant, Mr. Thomas Greg, as a private speculation. The following is the notice of this important event, as it was then considered, found in the *News-Letter*:—

“On Monday (August 21st, 1769), when the agreeable news arrived of Lady Donegall being safely delivered of a son and heir, Mr. Greg laid the corner foundation stone, at the termination next the sea, of the new quay which he is building on the north side of the dock of Belfast. This quay is 320 feet in length, and which, when finished, will give room for the accommodation of a much greater number of ships and deeper water than heretofore; and Mr. Greg, in commemoration of the birth of Lord Chichester, hath called said quay Chichester Quay.”

It is probable the corporation books, if procurable, would shew whether or not Mr. Greg’s quay was within the franchises of the borough. The return of this quay, fronting the Lagan, was called Merchants’-Quay, and within the memory of many persons now living was the great landing-place of the town,

the access to which was improved by the Harbour Trust removing, soon after its incorporation, a ford. The reclamation of the banks lying between Corporation-street and the navigation is comparatively recent; and the formation by the Tombe family of Donegall-Quay is of still later date, and within the memory of a multitude of persons still living.

As I am compelled to express myself unable to understand, after an anxious examination of his paper, Mr. Lowry's strictures on my notice of the ford, I find it necessary to commence *ab initio* by repeating the substance of what I formerly stated. Natural causes formed the Farsat; and when art was employed to convert it into a road-way, a rude framework of wood, secured by piles, was used to prevent the causeway being injured by a partial shifting of the bank, or by the rushing of the water over its surface. In this view I am borne out by Dr. O'Donovan—(See page 305, Vol. III.) Mr. Lowry seems to consider he has explained most satisfactorily an omission of nearly two lines in a quotation from Dr. Reeves, by insinuating that it was unworthy of regard, as being information supplied by me. It happens, however, that the same objection applies to the entire statement of Dr. Reeves, who had no other evidence with respect to the other portions than myself; and in a note at page 308 I explain how I had unintentionally been the means of leading Dr. Reeves into an error respecting the map of Captain Phillips, an error in which I was confirmed by several parties to whom I exhibited that map, the solicitors included of both parties in the legal proceedings more than once mentioned in the course of this discussion. This map, however, has no connexion with that given by Rapin's Continuator, which is the fruitful cause of all the differences of opinion respecting the ford. It is apparent that in illustrating that work it was only the fortified part that was given, and the map was limited to that object, so that, in fact, it shews a part of the Lagan and a part of the Blackstaff as one stream. If the reader will carefully observe the position of the street now called Ann-street on the plan of 1660, and then from his own local knowledge recollect the course of the Lagan above the bridge, he will see the absurdity of confounding it with the stream delineated as flowing past what is now called Corn-market. The absurdity will appear still greater when he asks himself what has become of the Blackstaff, and the site of Poultry-square, and the former May's-dock. A still better illustration is found in the maps of the Down Survey, which prove beyond doubt that a passage leading across a river toward the south side of Lord Chichester's house could not be a passage across the Lagan.

Mr. Lowry expends a considerable space in discussing the question of the plan published by him, but without in any degree answering my objection, viz.—that his copy is not as it professes to be and as it should have been—an accurate copy of the map contained in Tindal's Continuation of Rapin. It would have been more candid for Mr. Lowry to have adopted the excuse I furnished than have endeavoured to escape from the charge by referring to other parties who had committed the same mistake. It is quite clear his mistake arose from copying, not from the original work, but from an erroneous copy found in some other book. Every reader of the journal must know that my objection as regarded the question of evidence was that this plan was erroneous, in shewing a solid

bank across a river, where the original map, as published in the several editions of Tindal, shew a bridge, and this objection remains unanswered. If your readers will take the trouble, as Mr. Lowry requests, of turning to the maps at pages 249 and 300 of Vol. III., they will not find "that what Mr. Getty describes as 'the latest edition' of the 'so-called' plan of 1660 (which is an exact copy of Benn's) corresponds exactly with his favourite plan of 1688, except that the latter having been taken at a later date, as Mr. Benn himself points out at page 74 of his work:—*There is in it another street or lane leading from North-street, with the addition of several roads or cross-ways, both within and without the ramparts, and that the river also which flows through High-street was furnished at this time with six bridges.*"

Now, is it contrary to fact that I ever produced the plan at page 300, as a map of Belfast in 1688; I merely copied it as the map contained in all the editions I could find of Rapin or his Continuator, to shew that the map at 249 is not a correct copy. It remains for Mr. Lowry to produce the edition of Rapin from which he copied. I have given the references to the copies I consulted, so that if I am in error he has a ready means of detection furnished by myself. I may add that I have doubts if an instance can be given of a ford being represented in any map, by three straight unbroken lines crossing the river like a solid bank, and cutting the stream into two portions, as is shewn in Mr. Lowry's map. Such a road-way, if shewn at all, would be marked by dotted lines only, as any engineer will testify. With respect to Mr. Lowry's opinion, "but if neither plan had been copied by Rapin, that circumstance could in no respect detract from their value, as their being copied by him can add nothing to it," I have only to say, that until I read this paragraph I understood that this historian was the authority relied on. If Mr. Lowry can produce any authority for the map published by him as found in Rapin's history, in the name of common sense let him do so, and thus settle all our conjectures. In thus abandoning Rapin it seems to me he gives up the entire question, and that the remainder of his paper is only to be considered as performing the office of the ink-bag of a cuttle-fish by covering his retreat. As to the map itself, which appears in Tindal, I never expressed a doubt that it represented the state of things in 1660, though what Mr. Lowry publishes at page 249 as a copy does not, and I proved my acceptance of it as evidence by publishing an accurate copy, accompanied by a rough tracing of a map that I have little doubt was the original of this very plan.

The reference to a favourite plan of 1688 (page 257) I cannot understand, but I suspect, from inaccurate reading, Mr. Lowry has in some way applied my strictures on his plan of 1660 to a plan of 1688, to which at the time I was making no reference, and of the existence of which I have no knowledge. Let me again repeat that his plan shews a solid bank across a river in a place in that river where the plan he proposes to give shews a bridge.

I did not attack Mr. Kennedy, indeed I am not much given to make attacks or use unbecoming language, but I did, as I had a right in a question of literary evidence, point out in his case, and in that of persons who preceded him, the danger of altering documents so as to suit their own preconceived ideas of the intention of authors. In the case of General Bainbrigg's

sketch the falsification would have consisted in attempting to restore the sketch to what I chose to assume its original state; in like manner, had I given a copy of Mr. Kennedy's map, I assuredly would have copied it with all, what I considered, its errors, which I could not have considered myself justified in amending, and still calling the copy Mr. Kennedy's map. As to the correctness of my views on this subject I appeal to every one conversant with the rules of textual criticism, and as an example of my meaning I may instance the maps published by Government, with the state papers, the value of which altogether depends on the fact of their being exact copies of the originals.

The history of the composition map is very simple, and just such a one as Arrowsmith or any of the great constructors of maps might be required to give if the world were foolish enough to make the demand. There is no ancient map, shewing on a large scale both sides of the district, under consideration; but there are townland maps in the Hamilton collection of 1625-6, which give the county Down side, and a plan of 1660 in Tindal and other maps, which gives the Antrim side, and I am blamed for avowing that I put them together and made one general map of them.

At page 256 Mr. Lowry condescends to a line of argument that seems unsuited to a discussion where the sole object should be to elicit a historical truth from such evidence as exists. His words are—his own account of the "composition" map is as follows:—"All the county Down side is an exact copy of the same portion of the Hamilton Maps, showing the roads as they then appeared and the ford over Con's Water. A fac-simile (not Mr. Getty's 'exact' copy) of the Hamilton Map of Ballymacarrett in 1625-6 is placed in the hands of the editor of this journal, upon which it will be seen (if he should think it worth publication) that not a single road of any description is laid down. Mr. Getty had admitted this fact at page 302 of Vol. III., but again prefaces the admission by alleging that 'the Hamilton Maps exhibit what we may conclude were the roads existing at that period.' At page 310 of Vol. III., however, he had made an admission, which puts an end to the argument based on the non-existence of any road on the Hamilton Map of Ballymacarrett:—"There is no difference of opinion on one point, namely—that on the county Down side the ford commenced in some part of Ballymacarrett."

Now the plain statement of facts is this—I refer to THE HAMILTON MAPS, which consist of a bound collection of townland maps, of which Ballymacarrett is ONE. The reader, by referring to my composition map—I am not ashamed of the expression—will find that it contains part of at least TWO of these maps, so that when I speak of roads I speak of them as shewn on the HAMILTON MAPS, which is true, for they are in Ballyhackamore and Strandtown. If Mr. Lowry does not understand my meaning respecting roads I feel assured every other reader does, and will readily admit that there is no discrepancy in my statement that no roads are shewn as passing through the townland of Ballymacarrett, and that on the county Down side the ford commenced in some part of Ballymacarrett. It would have been a wretched sophism to have quibbled on the question of whether the sand-bank, along which the ford road according to my theory ran truly belonged to Bally-

macarrett, or should have been otherwise described. As it was alongside the hard soil of that townland, I did not hesitate to say, nor do I yet, that the ford commenced in Ballymacarrett; and to prevent future quibbles, I may add I now refer to the ford across the Lagan or bay at Belfast, and not to the ford across Con's Water. All evidence on the site of the ford must be confined to a period previous to the erection of the Long Bridge, between 1686 and 1690; for deductions from the direction of later-made roads are, to say the least, puerile. Now, I do affirm that no map has been shewn indicating the existence of any roads, much less the convergence of several at the Gooseberry-corner; but old maps—the Hamilton for example—prove unmistakably that such a convergence did occur at Strandtown, indeed within a few days an eminent Belfast merchant, a native of Newtownards, has informed me that the tradition of the old inhabitants there in his youth was that the original road thence to Belfast came out at Strandtown, a fact fully confirmed by Gillies's Map of the county Down, published in 1755, and by Harris's. I shall reserve my observations on Mr. Ritchie's evidence given in a law court until the conclusion of this letter; but in the meantime it is necessary to refer to other statements attributed to that gentleman. With respect to the strand road from Holywood mentioned by me, and referred to by Mr. Lowry, see Vol. IV., page 247, which by his own *ipse dixit* he converts into a foot-path, a foot-path along a hard strand!! I can only say I have known many old persons who had used this road regularly as a driving road, just as the maps shew it; indeed those documents enable an inquirer to trace very accurately the history of the roads leading to Holywood, and to determine that for a long series of years after the Long Bridge was built the only direct road was by the strand. I have little doubt Mr. Ritchie is correct in believing that this road skirted a part of the short strand, above the Long Bridge, for the road from the Gooseberry-corner is turned, so as to fall into it, not abruptly, but with a curve. Mr. Lowry, at page 258, introduces a reference to a record in the Dublin Exchequer Office, to shew that in the time of Henry III. the castle was described as the Castle of the Forde, and then assumes that this would not mean Mr. Getty's ford, which is at least a quarter of a mile lower down the river, and not commanded by the castle at all, which never would have defended it. The expression "*the ford*," as describing the locality now called Belfast, is common in early Irish history, and needs no explanation; but I confess I was never previously aware that the castle of Belfast stood on the Lagan, which seems implied in the expression "lower down the river." On the military expression, introduced by Mr. Lowry, of commanding the ford, I have only to remind the learned commentator that this expression is used, when used at all, in reference to cannon, an arm certainly not employed in Ireland in the reign of Henry III., as the first use of cannons on record is in the reign of that monarch's great-grandson, who, according to Barbour, used *crakys of war* against the Scots in 1327, and at Cressy, in 1346. In Ireland the introduction was still later for fire-arms of any kind were not used in this country till 1487, or, according to Anglo-Irish annals, 1489. *Ordanas*, as an Irish term, is used for the first time under the date 1488. The following extract from the "Lives of the Earls of Essex" shews how little effectual artillery was so late as

May, 1599. The reference is to the best appointed army England had up to that date sent to this country. It was commanded by Robert, the Second Earl:—"Having received the cannon and ammunition from Waterford, he next proceeded to attack the Castle of Cahir. This was considered a place of great importance, as commanding the passes into Tipperary, the White Knights country, Clanwilliam, and Muskerry. It was the chief stronghold of the rebels in those parts, situated on an island in the river Suir, whose banks were rocky, and besides made strong by art. Although the Lord Cahir was in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant, his castle was obstinately defended. The artillery of the army, consisting of one cannon and one culverin, which, for want of draught-horses, had been dragged by men from Clonmel, being brought up, 'a trench was cast up within fifty paces of the castle, and gabions set up and filled to cover the gunners. The culverin was placed somewhat further off, where it might see more of the flanks of the castle, and so beat down their sights. The next day, in the morning, as soon the watch was discharged, the cannon and culverin began to play; but the carriage of the former broke at the second shot, and could not be repaired in a day and a-half. The culverin was for sometime clogged up with a bullet, but being cleared, it shot that day some fifty rounds, so that the rebels scarce durst keep in any lower, or fight on that side.'"

It is not necessary to assume that the course of the Blackstaff was changed—this is not denied by any candid inquirer. Benn's words are, speaking of the old fortification, "the entrenchment then passed to the sea, terminating near the place which is now called May's-dock, and where the Blackstaff river formerly discharged itself, the present bed of that stream, from the Paper-mill to the Lagan, being an artificial cut." In a note the same author mentions that this improvement was made by Arthur, Third Earl of Donegal, in the beginning of the last century.

I have no wish to impugn the veracity of the witnesses to whose testimony Mr. Lowry refers, though I do not admit that they proved the site of the ford. Mr. Frazer is quite correct in stating that persons could cross the Lagan between the two bridges, and he would have been equally correct in stating, though he had not seen it, that previous to the reconstruction of the quays boys were in the habit of paddling about below the Long Bridge, in the navigation, searching for ropes, &c., lost from the vessels. This I have frequently witnessed; but this only shews that the Lagan could not keep open a deep channel. It does not appear that Mr. Frazer gave the date of the old roads he refers to, and the fact of their being paved is no proof whatever of their age; for, in consequences of the bad material at command, it was the custom to a late period to pave the centre of the roads in this part of Down. It is not very many years since the road from Strandtown to the turn a little beyond the Glass-house was made, which was paved, and continued to be paved until a recent period.

It is singular that the impossibility of building a bridge opposite High-street did not occur to Mr. Rennie or Mr. Woodhouse, both eminent men in their profession; and it is equally singular that neither they nor the surveyors they employed, nor the practical men they had under them, discovered the ford opposite Watson's-corner, so much relied on. Now

this ford, if it had existed at all, which I do not believe, would have been unmistakable, and it does not appear that any party ever had an object in removing it. The Galwally Ford, on a higher part of the Lagan, was well known to the period when it was removed by order of the late Mr. McCleery, about ten years ago. The reason for not building a bridge at the foot of High-street was not that believed by Mr. Frazer, but the difficulty of finding funds to reimburse the proprietors of valuable quay property, which would have been rendered of comparatively little value. Unfortunately this gentleman did not continue his borings below High-street, so that his evidence is wanting as regards the ford taken up by the harbour authorities. The evidence "that above the bridge the men employed came upon a solid foundation," may mean anything or nothing. If it is intended to state that an old foundation was found, it must refer to something connected with the old bridge; if it is intended to say that they found a part of the bed of the river sufficiently solid to carry the new bridge, I have no hesitation in believing that Mr. Frazer has been deceived, and that no architect would rest such a heavy structure on such a superficial base. It is evident that the assumption is that the solid foundation found was the old ford; and it is expected that reasonable men will believe that the bridge was built on this ford. Mr. Lanyon, the architect acting under the Board of Works, can say whether or not this is correct. Mr. Ritchie's supposed statements have been already alluded to; his evidence, however, as given by Mr. Lowry, does not throw any light on the question under consideration, for the best reason in the world, that he could not speak from his own personal knowledge as to the site of the ford. Now, my opinion of Mr. Ritchie is such, that I know no person on whose evidence, with regard to matters of which he had a personal knowledge, I would more fully rely, and it will be seen by referring to my article on the ford, page 314, that I have gladly availed myself of his practical information. The evidence of this gentleman, so far from proving a ford at Watson's-corner, goes merely to shew that he observed an artificial kind of causeway above the Long Bridge and opposite May's-dock. What this was he does not pretend to say, nor do I. I am, however, of opinion it was not a ford, and for this reason, that on Mr. Ritchie's shewing it must on the Antrim side have been opposite the mouth of the Blackstaff, not a site likely to be chosen for a ford; and, if I hazarded an opinion, it would be that Mr. Ritchie had met with some of the large stones placed in the river in connexion with the great salmon fishery which once existed here. The lighter loads of stones removed were probably connected with the same business, or dropped in during the erection of the first bridge. Mr. Ritchie's borings throw little light on the subject beyond what already existed, and I have already recorded his views about the bed of the upper part of the river. He is perfectly correct in stating that some of the roads—the one, for instance, leading from Gooseberry-corner to Watson's-corner—were in existence before he was born, but what is to the purpose he does not prove by any map or document—at what period it was made. We know by the Hamilton Maps this road had no existence in 1625 or 1626, the date of the Hamilton Survey, and to bear out Mr. Lowry's theory it must have been made between that date and 1690. But even to ascertain the year within this limited space of sixty-four years in

which the Gooseberry-corner road was made—I believe, however, its formation was posterior to the opening of the bridge—does not get over the difficulty how ancient travellers previously reached Watson's-corner, where Mr. Lowry imagines the ford was situate, nor does it get over the other difficulty of how parties who are supposed to have crossed at this part of the Lagan afterwards made their way across the Blackstaff, no trifling obstacle in itself.

Much is said about the convergence of roads, but this argument as far as it goes is decidedly in favour of my view; for, as already mentioned, all the maps ancient and modern shew the convergence at Strandtown. Mr. Ritchie's evidence cannot be considered conclusive with regard to facts occurring in the reign of James I., particularly when it is known that all old maps and other documents prove the incorrectness of his views—Harris's Map, for example, which does not shew any road coming down towards the river at Watson's-corner. With respect to this gentleman's evidence, I must further say that, as the entire of it depends on the assumption that certain roads which he points out as now existing approach the river at a certain point, it was imperative to give some evidence that they were old roads, which he has not been able to do, while I am fortified by the negative proof of their non-existence at the time the ford was in use afforded by the Hamilton Maps and all the old maps which can be produced, none of which recognise these roads. I may now add to the list Whitworth's map of 1768, which does not shew the roads referred to, though it shews other roads on the county Down side leading towards the Queen's Bridge. It would be most desirable if Mr. Ritchie, who is well acquainted with the county, would search the records at Down, in which he would probably find the order within comparatively modern times for forming the paved roads he lays such stress on. Any old inhabitant will tell him, as already stated, that a few years ago most of the roads leading to Belfast on that side were paved, even those lately opened. Further, I would ask Mr. Ritchie to take his stand, with the Hamilton Maps beside him, at what is now called Strandtown. If I recollect right, these maps shew a village at the place named West Holywood, and then, by a reference to the Ordnance sheets, he will find the following facts to be undoubted:—A road, also shewn on the Hamilton Maps, coming from the direction of Holywood, and at the point named turning suddenly down towards the sea-beach, and there joining a road over the beach leading towards Belfast. By comparing this with the Ordnance Maps, he will be struck with this fact, that the same line is shewn leading from Holywood to Strandtown, and the road also leading to the beach. As I have before said, the road in the strand no longer exists but in maps. He will further see that a line, not in the Hamilton Maps, is shewn leading direct to the present Newtownards-road, which it joins near Con's Water, and this road, I have no doubt, Mr. Ritchie has often heard called the New Holywood-road.

I cannot resist the temptation to add to the length of this article by another quotation from Mr. Lowry. My excuse must be the confirmation it contains of all my views respecting the position of the ford:—

"Now, if Mr. Getty had filled a whole number of the journal, as no doubt he might do, with copies of resolutions which the Ballast Board has from time to time passed for the

removal of the various other fords in the channel, from Chichester-quay to the pool of Garmoyle, how would this have afforded a particle of proof as to the true position of the ford of Belfast? That instead of its being a mere artificial obstruction in the channel or river, constructed of loose stones or timber, it was a great natural ford, *Farsad*, bar, or hard sand-bank, formed in the Lagan river by the High-street and Blackstaff rivers, as also by the Lagan itself and the reflux tide, Mr. Getty, with strange inconsistency, as appears to me, produces some most valuable authorities in addition to those which I cited from the *Annals of the Four Masters*, and the local histories of Harris, Benn, Berwick, and Reeves."

As to the authorities just mentioned it is only necessary to remind the reader that the necessity for the present discussion arises from their not giving any proofs respecting the position of the ford; but if Mr. Lowry has in this paragraph established a position, it is singularly enough the very one I have been contending for, namely—below the Blackstaff and the Farsat, or river now covered over in High-street, and this agrees perfectly with the order for removal given by the Harbour Board, and with the ford taken up under the direction of the present engineer. The Blackstaff, it must be recollected, before its direction was changed by Lord Donegall fell into the Lagan, close to where Queen's Bridge now stands.

At page 254 of your fourth volume Mr. Lowry has used these words—"and I, therefore, cannot help reminding him that since the publication of Dr. Reeves's book his own evidence on the subject has been recorded in the proper sense of the word; and that these resolutions have been pronounced by the verdict of a special jury in the cause of *Donegall v. Templemore* (before whom Mr. Getty was himself examined as a witness in support of his favourite ford) to have had no reference whatever to the ford of Belfast, which they found to have been situate above the Long Bridge, at the place indicated by the authorities cited in my note to the Hamilton MSS., and not below the old harbour or creek of Belfast, which Mr. Getty still maintains to be its true position." I have no hesitation in stating that all these assertions are incorrect. I have, indeed, attended as a witness, summoned by both parties, in the case referred to, principally to produce deeds, but never gave any evidence respecting the ford—indeed it was not the interest of either party to adopt the views I have advocated. It is equally incorrect to state that a jury had expressed any opinion as to the meaning of the Minutes of the Harbour Trust. The case of *Donegall v. Templemore* still remains undecided, being simply the question of the Marquis of Donegall's legal right to eject Lord Templemore from certain premises; and as far as I understand, from being a spectator at the various trials, the eminent lawyers employed on the part of the noble Marquis have always repudiated the site of the ford as determining the right. But even if the House of Lords decided that the ford was at Watson's-corner, I would not consider such decision as infallible, opposed as it would be to the evidence of those who took up the ford, and of the persons who made borings for Mr. Rennie and Mr. Telford.

I have to beg your indulgence for having trespassed at such length on your time and that of your readers, which I shall not continue to do beyond the space necessary to make the following

statement and proposal. The question at issue depends very much on a decision of the actual position of the passage shewn across a river in all the plans produced on either side, viz.—in Mr. Lowry's plan, Vol. III., page 249; in my copy from Rapin, at page 300; and in General Bainbrigg's sketch, at page 312, who marks it as across the Blackstaff, in this agreeing with my view in the Composition Map, at page 312. Now, my proposal is to submit all the copies of Rapin which the several parties can procure to some competent parties—say, the engineer officer now conducting the Ordnance Survey in this neighbourhood, or to the officer at the Phoenix Park Office, and let him decide which copy is most correct, and whether the thing represented is a ford or a bridge. Second.—To ask the same referees to lay down on any map of Belfast—Mr. Kennedy's for example—the plan of 1660, and say whether the ford or bridge, whichever it may be, shewn in that plan, is across any

part of the river Lagan or bay of Belfast. The last question I would refer to the decision of the parties named would be—whether, on inspection of any map produced, it appeared that any road existed previous to 1690, about which time the Long Bridge was first opened, leading down to Watson's-corner, and what is the earliest proof found of roads in that direction; also to say whether or not the Hamilton Map of Ballymacarrett shewed the *school-house* which, according to Mr. Lowry, "is plainly marked on the Hamilton map of Ballymacarrett;" and, finally, to decide as professional men whether the road so clearly shewn on all the published maps of the county Down leading along the strand is nothing more than a footway. If neither of the officers named consent to give an opinion, I am equally ready to defer to the joint opinion of the present surveyors of Down and Antrim, both gentlemen of high professional standing and personal honour.

I am, Dear Sir,

Yours faithfully,

EDMUND GETTY.